



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/758,852

01/16/2004

Frank J. Hammond II

413127

6951

30955

7590

09/09/2008

LATHROP & GAGE LC
4845 PEARL EAST CIRCLE
SUITE 300
BOULDER, CO 80301

EXAMINER

TRAN, ELLEN C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2134

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/09/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/758,852	Applicant(s) HAMMOND ET AL.	
	Examiner ELLEN TRAN	Art Unit 2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 4-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

1. This action is responsive to communication filed on: 9 June 2008 with acknowledgement of an original application filed on 16 January 2004 with the benefit of a provisional application filed 16 January 2003.
2. Claims 1, 2, and 4-19, are pending; are independent claims; claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 13, and 15, and 18 have been amended. Claim 3 has been canceled. Amendments to the claims are accepted.
3. The objection to claim 15 is removed due to amendment.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 9 June 2008 have been fully considered however they are not persuasive.

It is noted, PATENTS ARE RELEVANT AS PRIOR ART FOR ALL THEY CONTAIN
“The use of patents as references is not limited to what the patentees describe as their own inventions or to the problems with which they are concerned. They are part of the literature of the art, relevant for all they contain.” In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)). A reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including nonpreferred embodiments (see MPEP 2123).

I) In response to applicant's arguments on page 9, *“The '338 and '449 use different methods that require substantial, non-obvious modification to combine”*

Art Unit: 2134

The Examiner disagrees with the argument for multiple reasons. First both patents are classified in the class and subclass 726/23, therefore they are considered related because they are both directed to Intrusion Detection. As per the KSR ruling prior art directed to the same subject matter can and should be combined. Second as indicated in the OA the motivation to combine the agent based IDS with the real-time approach is to improve the effectiveness of an IDS. Third the motivation is provided by Munson col. 1, lines 53 et seq.

II) In response to applicant's argument on pages 10 and 11, *"That is, neither '338 nor '449 discloses monitoring an electronic network for abnormal activity using agent"*

The Examiner disagrees with argument. As stated in the OA '338 teaches monitoring for abnormal activity using the agents in col. 5, lines 26-31, note although column and line numbers are referenced the entire references must be considered, see MPEP 2123. Munson teaches that the agents signal the detection server which detects, i.e. monitors for threatening or otherwise suspicious activity i.e. abnormal activity.

III) In response to applicant's argument on page 10, *"Although '338 discloses that each member is provided with a Rainforest Agent, '338 fails to disclose that these Rainforest agents form a cooperative agent cell"*.

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First the cooperative agent cell using the broadest reasonable interpretation is a grouping of agents. Second '338 teaches as cited in the OA that the agents are grouped together. Third the applicant is trying to place limitations from their specification into the claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not be placed into the claims.

Art Unit: 2134

IV) In response to applicant's argument on page 10, *"Within '499, software within a system is modified to allow profiling of the software. However, '499 makes no disclosure of agents, let alone cooperative agent cells"*

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First, as stated above although column and line numbers are referenced the entire references must be considered, see MPEP 2123. Second it is not stated in claim 1 that the agents perform the initial assessment. Third the "profile transducer" as indicated in col. 4, lines 12-31 that collects samples to form a profile can be interpreted equivalent to an 'agent'.

V) In response to applicant's argument on page 10, *"Further, '499 is not agent based and therefore cannot operate as an agent installed within an electronic network"*

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First both references must be considered. Second as stated above the motivation to combine is well established. Third the "profile transducer" as indicated in col. 4, lines 12-31 that collects samples to form a profile can be interpreted equivalent to an 'agent'.

VI) In response to applicant's argument on page 11, *"Applicants would also like to point out that '338 fails to disclose monitoring the electronic network for abnormal behavior using the agents, as required by step (d) of claim 1"*.

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First both references must be considered. Second as stated above the motivation to combine is well established. Third the "profile transducer" as indicated in col. 4, lines 12-31 that collects samples to form a profile can be interpreted equivalent to an 'agent'.

Art Unit: 2134

VII) In response to applicant's argument beginning on page 11, *"Of note, the information profiled within '499 is based upon execution profiles of software and is not based upon network activity. Thus, even when combined, '338 and '499 do not perform an initial assessment of the electronic network."*

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First both references must be considered. Second as stated above the motivation to combine is well established. Third the it is obvious that a software profile can include network activities, software such as email, Internet browsers and many Microsoft readily recognize network links or network activities; therefore software can include network activities.

VIII) In response to applicant's argument on page 12, *"Broadcasting (described in the cited '338 passage) is not a bidirectional communication. The agentsof '338 are not delegated agents that establish bidirectional protocol to communicate with another delegated agent"*.

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First although column and line numbers are referenced the entire references must be considered, see MPEP 2123. Second as taught by '338 not only are alerts broadcast to Rainforest member, a threat detected within a Rainforest may be communicated to and evaluated by a second Rainforest. This cooperative alert ability taught in '338 col. 5, line 55 through col. 6, line 24.

IX) In response to applicant's argument beginning on page 12, *"Claim 6 recites that the step of logically connecting further includes self-organizing"*

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First although column and line numbers are referenced the entire references must be considered, see MPEP 2123. Second

Art Unit: 2134

as taught by ‘338 teaches that some or all peripheral devices in a network advertise their availability, this is logically self-organizing.

X) In response to applicant’s argument on page 13, “*Claim 7 recites ... via at least one covert communication protocol*”

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First although column and line numbers are referenced the entire references must be considered, see MPEP 2123. Second using the broadest reasonable interpretation a cover protocol is equivalent to a ‘special broadcast message via a non-routable protocol’.

XI) In response to applicant’s argument on page 13, “*Claim 8*”.

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First although column and line numbers are referenced the entire references must be considered, see MPEP 2123. Second using the broadest reasonable interpretation an initial assessment comprising mapping, communication ports and attached devices is equivalent to a probe that monitors hardware addresses.

XII) In response to applicant’s argument on page 13, “*Claim 9*”.

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First although column and line numbers are referenced the entire references must be considered, see MPEP 2123. Second using the broadest reasonable interpretation non-destructively intercepting is equivalent to collecting and analyzing that is done in ‘338.

XIII) In response to applicant’s argument on page 15, “*neither ‘338 nor ‘499 disclose or suggest cooperative agents forming at least one cooperative agent cell*”

Art Unit: 2134

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First although column and line numbers are referenced the entire references must be considered, see MPEP 2123. Second using the broadest reasonable interpretation two cooperative agents cells is suggest by '338 multiple Rainforest agents that cooperate with each other to send alerts.

IXV) In response to applicant's argument beginning on page 15, "*Neither '338 nor '499 disclose a correlation module as recited by element (i) ... '338 does not mention correlation – anywhere .. nor a simulating annealing correlator module*"

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First although column and line numbers are referenced the entire references must be considered, see MPEP 2123. Second using the broadest reasonable interpretation correlation as claimed describes reviewing the received data in order to detect abnormal behavior. This received data can also be simulated or set by a threat-detection scheme. A detection server that parses through records with threat-detection logic i.e. heuristics.

XV) In response to applicant's argument beginning on page 15, "*Neither '338 nor '499 disclose a correlation module as recited by element (i) ... '338 does not mention correlation – anywhere .. nor a simulating annealing correlator module*"

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First although column and line numbers are referenced the entire references must be considered, see MPEP 2123. Second using the broadest reasonable interpretation correlation as claimed describes reviewing the received data in order to detect abnormal behavior. This received data can also be simulated or set by a threat-detection scheme ... nature and value of its members. A detection server that

Art Unit: 2134

parses through records with threat-detection logic and that accounts for its member teaches i.e. heuristics, correlation ...

XVI) In response to applicant's argument beginning on page 16, "*Claim 18 ... That is '338 col. 2, lines 7-. That is, '338 process log and audit records to identify threats to a network and does NOT process network events themselves. Further again, '338 fails to disclose one or more correlation engines for sampling the electronic network events as required by setp (c)*"

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First although column and line numbers are referenced the entire references must be considered, see MPEP 2123. Second using the broadest reasonable interpretation multiple correlation engines are equivalent to the multiple servers that are defined with the multiple Rainforest agents. Third as shown in the Office Action '338 col. 2, lines 56-65 "an automatic cooperative response" is interpreted to be equivalent is a process to network event. This further taught in col. 5, lines 55-63, the response includes and alert to block traffic from particular networks or devices.

XVII) In response to applicant's argument beginning on page 19 "*Claims 2 and 5 ... '338 and '499 combination does not explicitly teach a type2 super agent ... The secure connection provided by the SSL protocol and used by '301 is not equivalent to the type 2 super peer agent providing authentication ... The shortfall of '338 and '449 in rendering claim 1 is also not overcome by '301*"

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First as stated above '338 and '449 teach the limitations of claim. The '301 is utilized to teach 2 super agent peer for authentication agents. This is taught in '301, the Applicant cannot place limitations from the specification into the claims.

Art Unit: 2134

XVIII) In response to applicant's argument beginning on page 21 directed to *Claims 10-14 the cited references fail to teach the independent claims*

The Examiner disagrees with argument for multiple reasons. First as stated above '338 and '449 teach the limitations of independent claim 1, independent claim 14 is taught by the combination of '338, '449, and '936 as stated in the below rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 15-17**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Norris et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,028,338 (hereinafter '338).

As to independent claim 15, “A system for monitoring events within an electronic network, comprising: a cooperative agent network having two or more agents, each agent installed within one component of the electronic network” is taught in '338 col. 1, lines 54-67, note the agents are interpreted to be equivalent to 'Rainforest Agent;

Art Unit: 2134

“the two or more agents forming at least one cooperative cell for collecting events from the electronic network, the cooperative agent network further comprising:” is taught in ‘338 col. 1, line 66 through col. 2, line 15 and ‘338 col. 5, line 67 through col. 6, line 6;

“one or more event correlation engines, each event correlation engine being connected to the electronic network and having a receive event handler for receiving the events addressed to the event correlation engine” is taught in ‘338 col. 1, lines 54-67, the correlation engine is interpreted to be equivalent to the ‘detection servers’;

“and one or more event correlation modules, each of the event correlation modules having an event pattern that defines events of interest” is taught in ‘338 col. 1, lines 54-67, note the correlation module is also interpreted to be equivalent to the ‘detection server’;

“each of the correlation modules receiving all events received by the event correlation engine, the event correlation module correlating the events of interest” is shown in ‘338 col. 2, lines 7-24;

As to dependent claim 16, **“wherein the event correlation module is a simulated annealing correlator module”** is taught in ‘338 col. 3, line 63 through col. 4, line 10.

As to dependent claim 17, **“the simulated annealing correlator further comprising: recorded events; a simulated annealing correlator engine; heuristics; and a correlation threshold; wherein the simulated annealing correlator engine utilizes the heuristics and the correlation threshold to correlate the events received by the event correlation engine with the recorded events, the correlated events being added to the recorded events”** is shown in 338 col. 3, line 63 through col. 4, line 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 18, and 19**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norris et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,028,338 (hereinafter ‘338) in view of Munson U.S. Patent No. 7,096,499 (hereinafter ‘499).

As to independent claim 1, “A method of protecting an electronic network, comprising: installing two or more agents within components of the electronic network” is taught in ‘338 col. 1, lines 54-67;

“logically connecting the agents into one or more cooperative agent cells” is taught in ‘338 col. 1, line 66 through col. 2, line 15 and ‘338 col. 5, line 67 through col. 6, line 6;

“monitoring the electronic network for abnormal activity using the agents” is disclosed in ‘338 col. 5, lines 26-31;

“and protecting the electronic network by blocking the abnormal activity using the agents” is taught in ‘338 col. 1, lines 56-67;

the following is not explicitly taught in ‘338:

“performing an initial assessment of the electronic network to determine normal activity” however ‘499 teaches that nominal profiles data are initially established by a

Art Unit: 2134

calibration process that is implemented by running the program in a calibration mode in col. 5, lines 5-15.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention of a method or system of a cooperative response to threat to domain security taught in '338 to include a mechanism to perform an initial assessment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification because it would be desirable to provide a real time intrusion detection program see '499 (col. 1, lines 53 et seq.) "One known system for detecting an intrusion is the EMERALDTM program. EMERALD defines the architecture of independent monitors that are distributed about a network to detect intrusions. Each monitor performs a signature or profile analysis of a "target event stream" to detect intrusions and communicates such detection to other monitors on the system. The analysis is performed on event logs, but the structure of the logs is not prescribed and the timeliness of the analysis and detection of an intrusion depends on the analyzed system and how it chooses to provide such log data. By monitoring these logs, EMERALD can thus determine that at some point in the event stream recorded in the log, an intrusion occurred. However, the detection is generally not implemented in real time, but instead occurs at some interval of time after the intrusion. Also, this system does not allow monitoring of all types of software activity, since it is limited to operating system kernel events. It would be desirable to provide a real time intrusion detection paradigm that is applicable to monitoring almost any type of program."

As to dependent claim 4, "wherein the step of installing further comprises: establishing bidirectional communication protocols for agent communication within the cooperative agent cells; delegating one or more agents in the cooperative agent cells to have

Art Unit: 2134

bidirectional communication with another delegated agent; and establishing bidirectional communication protocols for each delegated agent to communicate with another delegated agent” is shown in ‘338 col. 5, lines 55-63.

As to dependent claim 6, “**wherein the step of logically connecting further comprises self-organizing at least one of the agents into each of the cooperative agent cells**” is disclosed in ‘338 col. 6, lines 10-24.

As to dependent claim 7, “**wherein the step of establishing further comprising communicating via at least one covert communication protocol**” is taught in ‘338 col. 5, lines 55-63.

As to dependent claim 8, “**wherein the step of performing an initial assessment comprises: mapping systems, communication ports and attached devices of the electronic network; and establishing normal activity of the systems, communication ports, and attached devices**” however ‘499 teaches that the nominal profile data are initially established by a calibration process ... and that the software signals may be obtained from software probes or directly from a hardware address bus (a hardware probe) in col. 5, lines 5-38.

As to dependent claim 9, “**wherein the step of monitoring comprises: non-destructively intercepting communications on the electronic network; collecting events from the intercepted communications; and determining if the events indicate abnormal activity**” is shown in ‘338 col. 3, line 63 through col. 4, line 40.

As to independent claim 18, “**collecting electronic network events; sampling the electronic network events with one or more event correlation engines**” is taught in ‘338 col. 1, lines 54-67;

Art Unit: 2134

“passing sampled electronic network events from each event correlation engine to one or more event correlator modules within each event correlation engine; comparing events in each of the event correlator modules by sampling the events, determining if any of the events matches an event pattern, and, if there is a match, creating a new event announcing the match and passing the new event to the associated event correlation engine for electronic network distribution” is shown in ‘338 col. 2, lines 7-24;

“and determining patterns in events using a simulated annealing correlator, determining if the pattern is important, and, if so, creating a new event announcing the important pattern and passing the new event to the associated event correlation engine for network distribution” is disclosed in 338 col. 3, line 63 through col. 4, line 10;

the following is not explicitly taught in ‘338:

“A method of pattern recognition, comprising: performing an initial assessment of the electronic network” however ‘499 teaches that nominal profiles data are initially established by a calibration process that is implemented by running the program in a calibration mode in col. 5, lines 5-15.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention of a method or system of a cooperative response to threat to domain security taught in ‘338 to include a mechanism to perform an initial assessment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification because it would be desirable to provide a real time intrusion detection program see ‘499 (col. 1, lines 53 et seq.) “One known system for detecting an intrusion is the EMERALDTM program. EMERALD defines the architecture of independent monitors that are distributed about a network to detect intrusions. Each monitor

Art Unit: 2134

performs a signature or profile analysis of a "target event stream" to detect intrusions and communicates such detection to other monitors on the system. The analysis is performed on event logs, but the structure of the logs is not prescribed and the timeliness of the analysis and detection of an intrusion depends on the analyzed system and how it chooses to provide such log data. By monitoring these logs, EMERALD can thus determine that at some point in the event stream recorded in the log, an intrusion occurred. However, the detection is generally not implemented in real time, but instead occurs at some interval of time after the intrusion. Also, this system does not allow monitoring of all types of software activity, since it is limited to operating system kernel events. It would be desirable to provide a real time intrusion detection paradigm that is applicable to monitoring almost any type of program."

As to dependent claim 19, "wherein the step of sampling further comprises sampling all of, or less than all of, the electronic network events" is taught in 338 col. 3, line 63 through col. 4, line 10.

9. **Claims 2 and 5**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norris et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,028,338 (hereinafter '338) in view of Munson U.S. Patent No. 7,096,499 (hereinafter '499) in further view of Crosbie et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,007,301 (hereinafter '301).

As to dependent claim 2, the following is not explicitly taught in the combination of '338 and '499: **"wherein the step of installing comprises the step of installing a type 2 super peer agent for authenticating, authorizing and reauthorizing the agents"** however '301 teaches that the agents are authenticated by using the SSL communication protocol with the management station in col. 11, lines 1-15.

Art Unit: 2134

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention of a method or system of a cooperative response to threat to domain security taught in '338 and '499 to include a means to trust the various components on the Internet. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification because of the need for an effective host-based IDS system see '301 (col. 5, line 59 through col. 6, line 30) "As more business is done over the Internet, more trust is placed in critical infrastructure elements: the routers, hubs, and Web servers that move data around the net. They also include DNS name servers that allow users to access www.mycompany.com from their browsers. A DNS server is a computer that maps names such as www.company.com to an Internet address such as 10.2.3.4. By attacking these important infrastructure services, a hacker can bring the whole organization to its knees. Sometimes an attacker does not have to steal information. By simply making the systems unavailable for use the attacker can cause you losses in both financial terms and in credibility in the industry ... In summary, although host-based systems have numerous advantages as compared to network based systems, the difficulty is that prior art host-based systems require traditional signature matching against hundreds of templates. Up until now there have not been any effective host-based IDS systems. Thus, a need exists for an efficient host-based intrusion detection system".

As to dependent claim 5, "wherein the step of installing further comprises: broadcasting a request for agents to submit to authentication; and authenticating submitted agents" however '301 teaches that the agents are authenticated by using the SSL communication protocol with the management station in col. 11, lines 1-15.

Art Unit: 2134

10. **Claim 10**, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norris et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,028,338 (hereinafter '338) in view of Munson U.S. Patent No. 7,096,499 (hereinafter '499) in further view of Moran U.S. Patent No. 7,085,936 (hereinafter '936).

As to dependent claim 10, the following is not explicitly taught in the combination of teaching of '338 and '499: **“wherein the step of protecting comprises one or more of: luring a malicious agent that causes abnormal activity into a false appearance of success; planting instructions on information retrieved by the malicious agent to assist in identifying the origins of the malicious agent”** however '936 teaches that the system includes a trap system create a virtual cage in col. 7, lines 42-51;

“isolating electronic network components which have been compromised by the malicious agent; attacking the malicious agent; formulating a strategy to eliminate recently discovered vulnerabilities in the electronic network; installing patches to eliminate vulnerabilities in the electronic network; reassessing the electronic network to detect abnormal operations; and investigating abnormal operations of the electronic network” however '936 teaches “The inventive system focuses on discovering and presenting information about an attack, and presents configuration problems that are likely related to the attack, while suppressing those that aren't. Additionally, the presentation may show where relevant configuration problems fit within the factors that made the attack possible. This facilitates recovering from the attack, because the system administrator may be able to block future attacks of the same type by fixing only a subset of factors involved rather than having to fix every possible factor. It is also extremely useful in situations where one of the configuration problems cannot be changed due to its providing crucial functionality for the enterprise. For example, the

Art Unit: 2134

restore command should normally not be set to allow execution by normal users with SetUID to root because it can be used to allow a normal user to install his own SetUID program on the computer that gives him a root shell. However, the dump-restore command pair have features that make them preferable in various circumstances to the other commonly available archiving and file copying utilities, and thus a system administrator may decide that having this capability available is worth the security risk” in col. 12, lines 9-29.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention of a method or system of a cooperative response to threat to domain security taught in ‘338 and ‘499 to include a mechanism to quarantine attacked systems. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification because of the need to improve existing intrusion detection systems see ‘936 (col. 3, lines 3 et seq.) “The third dimension is real-time or after-the-fact. All conventional IDSes fall into the real-time category: their intention is to alert the operator to an attack so that he can respond in time to avert damage. However, the speed with which attacks are currently executed rarely allow time for any meaningful response from these systems. The after-the-fact category is dominated by forensic tools: utilities designed to help a computer security expert analyze what happened on a compromised host by extracting data that has been established as relevant to known attacks. The exception to this is the DERBI project (Diagnosis, Explanation and Recovery from Break-Ins), which experimented with the feasibility of after-the-fact detection of intrusions on hosts with no special data collection enabled. The DERBI project developed a loosely coupled system that processed data for a single known simulated host in an experimental testbed. The existing systems, however, have many limitations: they fail to utilize many useful sources of data, they produce large amounts of

Art Unit: 2134

information that are difficult for a human to analyze in a timely fashion, they are complex and difficult to use, and they are often designed for system administration rather than attack diagnosis”.

11. **Claims 11-13**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norris et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,028,338 (hereinafter ‘338) in view of Munson U.S. Patent No. 7,096,499 (hereinafter ‘499) in further view of Rowland et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,058,968 (hereinafter ‘968).

As to dependent claim 11, the following is not explicitly taught in the combination of teaching of ‘338 and ‘499: **“further comprising promoting one of the agents in each of the cooperative agent cells to a cell delegate”** however ‘968 teaches that the architecture of the system is designed to allow modularity. This modularity allows for the roles to be reversed. In col. 4, lines 44-67.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention of a method or system of a cooperative response to threat to domain security taught in ‘338 and ‘499 to include a means to develop a hierarchical agent installation promoting agents. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification because of the need to allow for flexibility for mobile autonomous agents see ‘968 (col. 1, lines 58 et seq.) “It is desirable to provide a computer security and management system that enables a distributed framework for command, control and communication that enables systems, devices and operational personnel to interact with a network as a unified entity. It is further desirable to provide this command, control and communication by using a core communication architecture that allows local and remote execution of mobile program code, and static execution of program

Art Unit: 2134

code. Such a system should enable flexible communication formats, self-healing network techniques, and expansion by adding new program modules, software handlers, and mobile autonomous agents”.

As to dependent claim 12, “further comprising: promoting a second agent in each of the cooperative agent cells to a type 1 super peer agent; authenticating new agents with the type 1 super peer agent; and communicating between the cooperative agent cells and a command and control console via the cell delegate to protect the network from malicious activity” however ‘968 teaches that the architecture of the system is designed to allow modularity. This modularity allows for the roles to be reversed. In col. 4, lines 44-67.

As to dependent claim 13, “the agents and cooperative agent cells being configured for independent and collaborative investigation of the electronic network, isolation of compromised components of the electronic network, and defense of the electronic network” however ‘968 teaches that the architecture of the system is designed to allow modularity. This modularity allows for the roles to be reversed. In col. 4, lines 44-67.

12. **Claim 14**, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norris et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,028,338 (hereinafter ‘338) in view of Munson U.S. Patent No. 7,096,499 (hereinafter ‘499) in further view of Moran U.S. Patent No. 7,085,936 (hereinafter ‘936).

As to independent claim 14, “A system for protecting an electronic network, comprising: a plurality of agents with the electronic network, the agents being grouped into at least one cooperative agent cell having one cell delegate” is taught in ‘338 col. 1, lines 54-67;

Art Unit: 2134

“a communications protocol within each cooperative agent cell, for (a) communicating between agents of the cooperative agent cell, and (b) communicating with cell delegates external to the cooperative agent cell” is taught in ‘338 col. 4, lines 41-55;

“means for detecting malicious activity” is shown in ‘338 col. 3, line 63 through col. 4, line 10;

“means for counter-intelligence to reveal the origin of the malicious activity” is disclosed in ‘338 col. 4, lines 45-51;

the following is not explicitly taught in ‘338: **“means for determining normal activity levels of the electronic network”** however ‘499 teaches that nominal profiles data are initially established by a calibration process that is implemented by running the program in a calibration mode in col. 5, lines 5-15.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention of a method or system of a cooperative response to threat to domain security taught in ‘338 to include a mechanism to perform an initial assessment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification because it would be desirable to provide a real time intrusion detection program see ‘499 (col. 1, lines 53 et seq.) “One known system for detecting an intrusion is the EMERALDTM program. EMERALD defines the architecture of independent monitors that are distributed about a network to detect intrusions. Each monitor performs a signature or profile analysis of a "target event stream" to detect intrusions and communicates such detection to other monitors on the system. The analysis is performed on event logs, but the structure of the logs is not prescribed and the timeliness of the analysis and detection of an intrusion depends on the analyzed system and how it chooses to provide such log

Art Unit: 2134

data. By monitoring these logs, EMERALD can thus determine that at some point in the event stream recorded in the log, an intrusion occurred. However, the detection is generally not implemented in real time, but instead occurs at some interval of time after the intrusion. Also, this system does not allow monitoring of all types of software activity, since it is limited to operating system kernel events. It would be desirable to provide a real time intrusion detection paradigm that is applicable to monitoring almost any type of program.”

the following is not explicitly taught in the combination of ‘338 and ‘499:

“means for isolating compromised components of the electronic network” however ‘936 teaches that the system includes a trap system create a virtual cage in col. 7, lines 42-51;

“means for repairing damage caused by the malicious activity; means for determining vulnerabilities in the current protection provided by the plurality of agents; and means for improving protection to resist future attack on the electronic network” however ‘936 teaches “The inventive system focuses on discovering and presenting information about an attack, and presents configuration problems that are likely related to the attack, while suppressing those that aren't. Additionally, the presentation may show where relevant configuration problems fit within the factors that made the attack possible. This facilitates recovering from the attack, because the system administrator may be able to block future attacks of the same type by fixing only a subset of factors involved rather than having to fix every possible factor. It is also extremely useful in situations where one of the configuration problems cannot be changed due to its providing crucial functionality for the enterprise. For example, the restore command should normally not be set to allow execution by normal users with SetUID to root because it can be used to allow a normal user to install his own SetUID program on the computer that gives him a root shell.

Art Unit: 2134

However, the dump-restore command pair have features that make them preferable in various circumstances to the other commonly available archiving and file copying utilities, and thus a system administrator may decide that having this capability available is worth the security risk” in col. 12, lines 9-29.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention of a method or system of a cooperative response to threat to domain security taught in ‘338 and ‘499 to include a mechanism to quarantine attacked systems. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification because of the need to improve existing intrusion detection systems see ‘936 (col. 3, lines 3 et seq.) “The third dimension is real-time or after-the-fact. All conventional IDSes fall into the real-time category: their intention is to alert the operator to an attack so that he can respond in time to avert damage. However, the speed with which attacks are currently executed rarely allow time for any meaningful response from these systems. The after-the-fact category is dominated by forensic tools: utilities designed to help a computer security expert analyze what happened on a compromised host by extracting data that has been established as relevant to known attacks. The exception to this is the DERBI project (Diagnosis, Explanation and Recovery from Break-Ins), which experimented with the feasibility of after-the-fact detection of intrusions on hosts with no special data collection enabled. The DERBI project developed a loosely coupled system that processed data for a single known simulated host in an experimental testbed. The existing systems, however, have many limitations: they fail to utilize many useful sources of data, they produce large amounts of information that are difficult for a human to analyze in a timely fashion, they are complex and

Art Unit: 2134

difficult to use, and they are often designed for system administration rather than attack diagnosis”.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2134

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ellen C Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3842. The examiner can normally be reached from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/ELLEN TRAN/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2134

5 September 2008